

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 have been canceled above, and new claims 21-31 have been presented. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103 based on Ciccone et al. and Moshir et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to new claims 21-31, based on the following.

New claim 21 recites a computer implemented method for managing a change to a setting of a computer program of a computer system. An automatic attempt is made to change a setting of the computer program. If the setting of the computer program is successfully changed, the computer program writes a predetermined return code to a log file. If the setting of the computer program is not successfully changed, the computer program does not write the predetermined return code to the log file. Responsive to the automatic attempt to change the setting of the computer program, there is an automatic search of the log file for the return code. If the log file contains the return code, a notification that the setting of the computer program was successfully changed is automatically sent. If the log file does not contain the return code, a notification that the setting of the computer program was not successfully changed is automatically sent.

Ciccone et al. discloses:

"Each of templates 28,30 for the products and platforms is a record of the objects that make up a vendor/system product or a grouping of objects that logically need to be monitored. Objects, for example, may be files, processes and/or disk shortage, that are necessary to successfully operate the product or application. Each of the exemplary software products 10, 12, 14, 15 has a label consisting of the product name and the version number. The templates 28,30 for the products list all of the objects included in that product, the attributes needed to be verified for each object, the expected values for those attributes, and the severity associated with divergence from the expected value. Examples of objects (and their attributes) are : (1) platform (CPU type, operating system version, operating system release); (2) files (path name, owner, group, permissions, size

in bytes, CRC, number of links, links resolution); (3) processes (process name, duration or execution); and (4) disk storage (drive, identifier, total capacity, user warning threshold, help desk warning threshold).

The system 2 facilitates the definition of all the platform, software and hardware objects that need to remain unchanged and require monitoring, and then verifies that those objects have not changed. When the system 2 runs a verification, it refers to the templates 28,30 to know which attributes to check and their expected values. It then compares the expected values against the current values on the platforms 6,8. In turn, the system 2 reports and logs any difference found between the template values and the current values." Ciccone et al. Column 3 line 4 to Column 4 line 10.

Thus, Ciccone et al. discloses a comparison between a template of objects that are supposed to make up a system, and the actual objects in the system to determine if they match. However, in contrast to new claim 21, Ciccone et al. does not disclose that responsive to an automatic attempt to change a setting of the computer program, there is an automatic search of a log file for the corresponding **return code**. The return code indicates whether the setting of the computer program was changed in the attempt, and is not the setting itself. In summary, Ciccone et al. compares "before and after" snapshots, whereas new claim 21 dynamically monitors the change process. Moshir et al. was cited to show remote scheduling of execution or installation, and therefore, does not fill the gap of Ciccone et al. New claim 21 would not have been obvious in view of Ciccone et al. because it is not taught or suggested by Ciccone et al. and also because Ciccone et al. pursue a different approach, comparison of "before and after" snapshots". Therefore, the rejection under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

New claims 22-24 depend on claim 21 and therefore, distinguish over Ciccone et al. and Moshir et al. for the same reasons that new claim 21 distinguishes thereover.

New, independent claim 25 distinguishes over Ciccone et al. and Moshir et al. for the same reasons that new claim 21 distinguishes thereover.

New claims 26-28 depend on claim 25 and therefore, distinguish over Ciccone et al. and Moshir et al. for the same reasons that new claim 21 distinguishes thereover.

New claim 29 recites a computer program product for managing a change to a permission file in a computer system. The permission file indicates which User IDs have access to which other files. First program instructions automatically attempt to change a permission file. The permission file indicates which User IDs have access to which other files. Second program instructions are responsive to the attempt to change the permission file, to automatically query an exit status code corresponding to the attempt to change the permission file, to determine whether the attempt to change the permission file was successful. The second program instructions automatically send a notification indicating whether the attempt to change the permission file was successful.


As explained above, Ciccone et al. discloses a comparison between a template of objects that are supposed to make up a system, and the actual objects in the system to determine if they match. However, in contrast to new claim 29, Ciccone et al. does not disclose second program instructions, responsive to the attempt to change a permission file, to automatically query an exit status code corresponding to the attempt to change the permission file, to determine whether the attempt to change the permission file was successful. The exit status code indicates whether the permission file was changed in the attempt, and is not the permission file itself. In summary, Ciccone et al. compares "before and after" snapshots, whereas new claim 29 dynamically monitors the change process. Moshir et al. was cited to show remote scheduling of execution or installation, and therefore, do not fill the gap of Ciccone et al. New claim 29 would not have been obvious in view of Ciccone et al. because it is not taught or suggested by Ciccone et al. and also because Ciccone et al. pursue a different approach, i.e. comparison of "before and after" snapshots". Therefore, the rejection under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

New claims 30-31 depend on claim 29 and therefore, distinguish over Ciccone et al. and Moshir et al. for the same reasons that new claim 29 distinguishes thereover.

Based on the foregoing, the present patent application as amended above should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 17 2007
Telephone: 607-429-4368
Fax No.: 607-429-4119


Arthur J. Samodovitz,
Reg. No. 31,297